

CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

NEW SERIES
VOL. I, No. 10.

BRANTFORD, ONT., APRIL, 1894.

WHOLE NO.
350.

In this issue will be found an able article by Mr. Wm. McEvoy, upon the detection of foul brood. A great deal has been said and written on this subject. Years ago when the editor of this journal, spent two years with D. A. Jones, then of Beeton Ont., he had some experience with foul brood and saw many of the tests Mr. Jones made. Since that time we have believed that the means of developing the disease is 1st, through the honey, 2nd, through the larvae developing in a cell having the germs of the disease.

The second source is easily disposed of by shaking the bees upon fresh combs. The first is much the most dangerous source. The honey may become diseased through being stored in a cell having the remains of the young bee or larvae therein. The bees when swarming or when otherwise placed in a new hive may take the germ with them in the honey, with which they so readily supply themselves and thus start foul brood in a new hive. Or the colony having the disease, and becoming weakened may be robbed by another colony, and this latter colony carrying home the diseased honey start up a case of foul brood.

While we may say without boasting that we have had a more than average education along scientific lines, we have never felt capable of deciding from a scientific standpoint the following question: Is the disease transmitted either through the ovaries of the queen, or through germs of the disease existing in the nurse or other bee, aside from what may be contained in the

honey in their sack? This we, however, know, from a practical standpoint, the disease has been cured in a great many instances without change of queen, and without change of nurse or other bees. Though this be the case, we are, perhaps, not entirely safe in taking it for granted that the disease is never perpetuated in this way. But that it rarely is, we, at least know, and more, that for practical purposes this phase of the question need not be considered, and for this reason: If four hundred and ninety-nine times out of five hundred, the disease is not transmitted by nurse or other bees, or the queen, and there is no other way of treating the colony and saving the bees, (for it will not pay to destroy them, even if one colony in one hundred would transmit the disease as suggested), it would not even pay to change the queen, if in rare cases, she, through her ovaries, did, transmit the disease. We must never forget to look at the question from a practical standpoint, on the other hand *true science* should be a guide to the practical man, even as a *truly scientific* man will never ignore practical experience. Now to return to the method of curing, the method which will entirely dispose of the honey, which most readily transmits the disease, has shown itself to be correct. The starvation plan will accomplish this. The rapidity with which bees will consume honey depends greatly upon their activity. Mr. S. Cornell, in the Review in February, appears to forget this, he says: "I recently met with an account of one of Mr. D. A. Jones' experiments in which he